

COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND BUILDINGS

August 6, 2007

**Aldermen Thibault,
Smith, Forest, Roy, Long**

5:00 PM

**Aldermanic Chambers
City Hall (3rd Floor)**

In the absence of the Chairman Thibault, the Clerk called the meeting to order.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to name Alderman Forest Chairman Pro Tem.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Smith, Forest, Roy, Long

Absent: Alderman Thibault

Messrs.: Alderman Lopez, Deputy City Solicitor Arnold, Robert MacKenzie,
David Beauchesne, Gary Janas

Chairman Forest addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Communication from Deputy City Solicitor Arnold submitting a Private Sector Use of Former Portsmouth Branch Rail Right-of-Way Line application received from Gary Janas.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to remove item 3 for discussion.

Alderman Roy stated I don't disagree with Alderman Smith that we're probably going to end up approving this but my concern is running the gas line across the Right-of-Way and what that will do to (1) the caveat for unobstructed use of the rail line and future plans for trails and that may be a Bob MacKenzie question more so than a Solicitor question or both.

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold stated if I could just for a minute this initial request actually came in sometime ago. Apparently, I don't know what happened to the initial request but I had been speaking to Mr. Janas. I had also spoken to Parks and Recreation about their concern for a gas line specifically Chuck DePrima

sometime ago. He indicated that he would not have an objection to a gas line. This gas line is supposed to be buried not on the surface as long as it was placed in a metal sleeve to protect it some minimum distance under the ground, which I don't recall right now.

Alderman Roy stated the gas line is to run north across to provide gas to that lot...Mr. Janas if you just want to come to a microphone...center chair. One of my other basic questions is there's not other gas line on Beech Street that you can tie into and use the roadway as we typically do.

Mr. Gary Janas stated that's been the problem we've had all along is that the only gas line is all the way down by Cilley Road which wasn't feasible for the gas company and the gas company had agreed to sleeve it and everything else, put it underground...it's just cutting perpendicular to the railroad line on the property next to us because they had come through I can't remember the steel place that's behind us...they come through their yard and ended it where the Bird Bath Laundromat is so they've just got to cut across over to our building.

Alderman Roy stated okay so you'd be extending this how far...there wasn't a measurement on your map.

Mr. Janas stated where it ends up over at Bird Bath probably about 60 feet or so.

Alderman Roy stated and you would be tying into a two-inch high-pressure line and you'd be having KeySpan do the work.

Mr. Janas stated KeySpan's doing it all. In fact I've had this letter from them where they've talked to Parks and Recreation about it and everything else and how they were going to sleeve it and everything else, they have the okay from Bird Bath Laundromat to do it. What we waiting for (hopefully) is the okay from the City.

Alderman Long stated as the Solicitor said it's going underneath the railroad.

Mr. Janas stated correct.

Alderman Long stated actually a copy of that letter would probably help...that's KeySpan's correspondence saying what their responsibilities would be.

Mr. Janas stated yes it is. I don't know if you have a copy of it or not.

Alderman Long stated I didn't see one in here.

Chairman Forest asked are there any other questions. There were none.

Alderman Long stated just a clarification...it's in our purview to allow gas pipes going underneath this easement of this rail bed.

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold stated yes it is in your purview, however, it depends on what type of permission Janas Plumbing is requesting. If they're requesting the normal revocable license it's within the Board's purview to grant that under the policy. If they're requesting an easement it's within the Board's purview to grant that, however, because this is the former rail line we will need a consent by the State Department of Transportation the Rail Division to do that. So it would have to be contingent on the state giving consent.

Chairman Forest asked would it be advisable then to have a motion make on the condition that they work with you to come up with the right wording?

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold replied subject to the review of the City Solicitor yes. And I guess being clear about what type of permission you're recommending and ultimately the Board hopefully granting whether that's a revocable license or an easement.

Alderman Long stated actually a revocable license...I've been kind of not right now wouldn't it if we allowed a gas line going under there and then we revoke it...what are they going to move the gas line.

Chairman Forest stated that's something they'd have to work out the wording with Solicitor Arnold.

Alderman Long stated so Mr. Janas may be...he has a choice...either a revocable license...is that the way I understand it?

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold replied yes. I just want to be clear about what is being requested and what is being granted...the revocable license or an easement.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the clarification from the Clerk would state that if you do a revocable license he could be asked to remove that gas line. If you do an easement then it's a perpetual easement of sorts that the City would be granting. There is a difference between the two and in an easement case you would have to...as Mr. Arnold indicated...get permission elsewhere to do that as well...their concurrence that it is acceptable. Generally with a gas line going across it it's more of a permanent nature so I'm thinking that it's probably more to

be considered that that's not what was submitted to the City. The City was submitted a revocable license request which requires nothing more than the action by the City but does leave them open to having to remove it in the event the City wants them to or ends the agreement.

Alderman Long asked if the license was revoked for any particular reason whose responsibility...would KeySpan take on that responsibility of moving this pipe or would they be charging the City?

Chairman Forest stated I think that's why we ought to have Solicitor Arnold work it out with language in a contract.

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold stated the normal revocable license that we use does provide that that's the expense of the applicant. So no it would not be a City expense.

Alderman Long moved to recommend approval of application subject to the review with the City Solicitor as to whether it be a revocable license or an easement.

Chairman Forest asked do you want them to come back to the Committee with it or just vote and let it go through under those conditions?

Alderman Long replied I'd move to let it go through under the conditions that he works out with the City Solicitor.

Alderman Roy stated I would like to make sure that this goes to the full Board and also just a question to Mr. MacKenzie. If future rail use whether it be commuter rail, ATV traffic, walking traffic, bicycle traffic...is this typical or will a gas line under that and again this is more for your information than mine...what are the changes of Mr. Janas having to move this line in the future?

Mr. Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning and Community Development, replied if KeySpan does the work they know because there are gas lines already underneath that trail...that rail line that go down Beech Street which is right near here. So there are a lot of gas lines underneath rails so KeySpan does the work. I'm sure that it should not be an issue for any future rail.

Alderman Roy stated so it will be built that there won't be any future impediment and so if we do a license or an easement he most likely would not have to remove this correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that's my impression.

Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Forest addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from Denise van Zanten, Library Director, advising of the City being approached by Doug Martin of Grubb and Ellis as to whether or not the City would be interested in purchasing property located at 115 West Street for use as a parking lot for the West Side Library and William B. Cashin Senior Center.

(Note: communication from the Director of Planning submitting recommendations as requested by the full Board enclosed.)

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to remove item 4 for discussion.

Alderman Roy stated do you want to make a presentation for us.

Mr. MacKenzie stated just two minutes if I could. The Board did ask that I review the property to see if the City could purchase it and what it could be used for. I did meet with a number of people including, of course, Denise and Barbara to examine their current parking situation. It did strike me that it is very tight at the present time for both the Library and the Senior Center. I went through and looked at...I did a quick sketch as to how many spaces could be actually put in and that came out to about 25 spaces plus or minus one or two spaces. When it gets into final design that would actually be a fairly I think it was a 40% increase in spaces if you took the parcel. Again, I did a little sketch that shows the parcel...it's irregularly shaped so it can't be perfectly laid out into parking but it does provide a usable number of spaces. You would have to take down two buildings...the properties at 115 West Street...you" have to take down two existing buildings. I did meet with the broker for the property. I review the Building Commissioner and myself walked through the property and I got an estimate from the Highway Department for putting in the parking. So, I did get a revision from the Highway Department...the sheet I just handed out. And just running down through the acquisition...the asking price is \$209,000 and it's been on the market for a couple of months. Without this committee's approval I have not gone into any negotiations to make an offer yet....miscellaneous closing costs \$3,500, demolition and backfill of the cellar hole \$35,000, environmental remediation as may be required. There was an environmental assessment done in the year 2000

but the City if it was going to acquire it should have another one done because there has been automotive uses in there. Construction of the lot and landscaping about \$88,000. So that gives you can idea of what the costs could be for the project. Again, we have not negotiated any price until the committee or the Board told us to do so. At this point I don't know where the money would come from.

Chairman Forest stated you mentioned two buildings...I thought I was familiar with the property...I didn't think there were two. I know the garage and the part they used for their office but where would the second building be.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it's actually two buildings that are rather fairly close together but as you drive down the alley heading towards the Library you'll see where there's currently an auto shop in there and that's part of the main building...what I call the main building and then there's a garage just a little further in that has four stalls in it so there are two buildings.

Alderman Long stated the demolition and backfill of cellar hole...there is a cellar to this. From what I'm reading there's only a slab.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Building Commissioner and I went into the basement. There's a basement for one-half of one of those buildings...the rest is slab.

Alderman Long stated such as 800 square feet is cellar.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes. It's relatively small and it's the traditional old fashioned kind of cobweb space but there is a cellar hole that would have to be filled in and in this case it would have to be structural fill because there would be parking on top of it.

Alderman Long stated actually I know the retaining wall that would be...on this map where you have the sloped granite curb is that green retaining wall do you know...is that where the retaining wall would be?

Mr. MacKenzie replied there would have to be...I don't know if you can see but do you see where the three trees that we showed are...there is a building that's kind of land locked...there's not public street frontage for that building and the face of the building is right on the property line. So that's why we showed some landscaping there to kind of screen them from the glare from the cars but there does have to be some retaining wall protection right against that house.

Alderman Long stated one further if I may...as far as egress for elderly is this good spaces for the Library and the Cashin Center in your opinion with respect to egress, wheelchairs, slow walking, what have you?

Mr. MacKenzie replied in my opinion and I'd probably defer a little bit to both Barbara and Denise the Senior Center you can go directly down this alley, this property touches the current parking beside the West Side Library but there is an entrance to both the West Side Library and a lower entrance to the Senior Center that you can go in from this level. Remember there's another level in the main entrances there but there is a lower level you can access from this grade right here. But, again, both Directors are here and maybe they could answer that better.

Alderman Smith stated I'm more interested in the cost, Bob...the asking price is \$209,000...negotiable...but you've got projected costs of \$143,500. If you add those two together it's \$352,000 for 25 parking spaces which comes out to about \$14,000 a space and I think that's very costly...the cost is so great and even if we negotiate with the homeowner I'm sure \$209,000 can come down...but those costs are accurate...the \$143,500 that you gave me right...the estimates from the Highway Department.

Mr. MacKenzie stated they're still estimates...the cost of construction I thought came in a little bit higher than I was expecting but partly that's because that's a contract price for Highway and that's if they were going out-to-bid. If the Highway had the time and the crews to work on it that number would be significantly less. But, again they gave me a contract price so I don't know if we can get that down.

Alderman Smith stated you haven't been in negotiations with this company or the homeowner at all.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I've met a couple of times with the broker. The owner actually lives in Florida but I have talked with the broker a couple of times...we bounced off some ideas but did not arrive at any negotiated price no.

Alderman Smith stated flexibility...do you think there's any leeway where he'd come down a significant amount because I noticed where the properties are and I think that \$209,000 is awfully high for what he's asking...that's my own personal opinion.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I'd be happy to talk a little bit more about the place but I'd probably prefer to do that in non-public session so that it does not in any way affect our abilities but if you'd like to I'd be happy to go into non-public and talk about that more.

Alderman Lopez stated regarding environmental...I don't particularly see any major problem because there'd be no building there and the pavement would have no effect if there was any environmental issues there from what I understand... could you clarify that.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it has been used as an auto body shop. It looks at though the current operation is fairly controlled in terms of...they have an oil tank inside the building not underground and they do recycle that. So that seems to be in pretty good control but I don't know over the last six years whether there's been any oil leaks that have gotten into the dirt. So that is really just a contingency that I think would be safe to carry if you find something unusual during demolition asbestos and any number of things. Again that's a relatively modest amount to carry for potential environmental issues.

Alderman Lopez stated I would recommend the committee go into non-public session and hear Mr. MacKenzie out and I'm sure you'll find some favorable issues. Alderman Smith and I attended also attended a meeting today with NeighborWorks and this would really clean up that particular neighborhood. There's been a lot of complaints in that ward in reference to the mechanic shop that's there and different things and Alderman Thibault and myself have consulted with the people over there many times so the most important thing is that we all know that when we put the Senior Center over there they wouldn't have enough parking...that's no secret to nobody. After two-and-a-half years trying to get a Senior Center at some location either on the east side or west side we settled for the west side and at that time Dave Nixon also raised \$500,000 for the Senior Center. So, I think if the committee takes a good look at this I would urge the committee after they consult with Mr. MacKenzie to authorize a go and come back with some type of Purchase and Sale Agreement under the condition the Board of Mayor and Aldermen approve the sale. I talked to the broker before I sent the letter that Denise sent to me and the Mayor and he's indicated there's some favorable results if we move forward. So, with that Mr. Chairman if you want to go into non-public session.

Alderman Roy moved to enter non-public session under the provisions of RSA 91:A II (d) "Consideration of the acquisition, sale or lease of real or personal property which, if discussed in public, would likely benefit a party or parties whose interests are adverse to those of the general community." The motion carried unanimously on a roll call vote.

A non-public session was held. Present were Aldermen Forest, Roy, Long, Smith, Lopez, and Garrity. Also present was Tom Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning & Community Development, Deputy Clerk Matt Normand, and Deputy City Clerk Carol Johnson. The discussion centered around the potential to negotiate a price for purchase of the parcel for parking lot use by the Senior Center and associated costs for removal and development of the property that would contribute to the final cost to the City.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to exit non-public session.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was unanimously voted to authorize the Planning Director to negotiate with the owner of the property and return to the Committee with a proposal to be considered for future recommendation.

Chairman Forest addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from Jennie Angell, Interim Director of Information Systems, requesting early notification be provided to Information Systems of proposed departmental relocations to assure all technology costs associated with the moves are included in the decision making process.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to remove item 5 for discussion.

Ms. Jennie Angell, Interim Director of Information Systems, stated the reason for this letter is really just to give you a heads up...I'm not looking for any formal action but we've had a number of moves...the new police substation and the OYS move and frequently people forget that there are technology costs involved and every site is unique, every department is unique and just if we are included in the process early on so we can make sure you have all the true costs and we can avoid surprises afterwards.

Alderman Roy stated I was just going to thank Jennie for bringing this to our attention because as you know information technology tends to be the last one to know about a lot of things and if we just direct the Clerk to send a letter to department heads as well as copy the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and the Mayor's office that we would refresh everyone's minds that they do have a lot of work whenever we do move a department so if we could send a letter and I think that will help remind everyone of your importance.

Alderman Long stated with that said...what Alderman Roy just said wouldn't it behoove us also to give you a heads up whereas if they needed equipment...laptops, what have you wouldn't you have the best deals?

Ms. Angell replied all of the technology...the computers and the network do come through our office so the departments don't go out and buy them on their own. But what has happened is everything's approved, the money's budgeted and we haven't heard about it and then they come to us and say do this, this and this you need another \$20,000 and nobody's got the money. So that's what I'm trying to avoid but it all does come through us.

Chairman Forest asked do we need letters or anything to department heads on this or do you just want to receive and file this?

Ms. Angell stated that's fine.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to receive and file the communication from Ms. Angell and notify department heads of same.

Alderman Roy stated you don't want letters going out to department heads Jennie.

Chairman Forest stated I added that in the motion by the way.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated we can send an e-mail out to notify everyone.

Ms. Angell stated I'm not looking for something to be real formal just something to kind of remind people.

Chairman Forest stated an e-mail will do that. Thank you, Matt.

Chairman Forest addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Copy of a communication from Dennis Hebert, VISTA Program Director, to the CIP Committee requesting funds in the amount of \$12,000 for the purpose of relocating to the former OYS offices at the Rines Center.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to remove item 6 for discussion.

Chairman Forest asked Dennis is he here...he's not here.

Alderman Long stated I'm assuming they're all looking for the \$12,000...they're looking for us to authorize them the use of the Rines Center.

Chairman Forest stated it sounds like they're asking for the use of that and also for us to send a communication to CIP. I guess we can authorize the use of the building but the \$12,000 I think that's going to be a different item.

Alderman Smith stated the Board of Mayor and Alderman already gave them approval to move to the Rines Center.

Chairman Forest asked then why is it coming to this Committee?

Alderman Smith replied for \$12,000.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it's also been referred to CIP as well.

Alderman Roy asked can we table this until we get a report from CIP because we don't have a lot of money to allot.

Alderman Smith moved that this item and the request of \$12,000 be referred to the Committee on CIP. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Forest addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Communication from David Preece, Southern NH Planning Commission Executive Director, requesting the installation of an information kiosk at an appropriate location at City Hall.

Alderman Roy moved that the request be forwarded to the Planning Director and report back to the Committee with an appropriate location through either phone poll or at a full meeting unless someone wants to speak to the appropriate location.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated it should also be the Clerk's office.

Alderman Roy stated to include the Clerk's office.

Alderman Long duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Forest addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Communication from Kevin Lane requesting to purchase TM 254, Lot 20. (Note: communications from Kevin Lane, Planning Department and State of NHDOT enclosed.)

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to remove item 8 for discussion.

Alderman Roy stated I have one question...has it been determined who owns this property?

Mr. David Beauchesne, Urban Planner, replied we're pretty sure the City owns the property. The City Surveyor out of the Highway Department believes that's the case and it probably makes sense that we operate on that basis. We're trying to determine if that's a separate parcel...we think it is also...we're not totally sure, however, and we're doing some back checking now on that very matter. Is it part of the very large rail right-of-way or is it just a little small piece. We think it's a subdivided off piece but we're checking to make sure. If that's the case and we want to sell the property to Mr. Lane we have to seek approval from the NHDOT and a Section 106 study has to be done and carried out in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration...that's a Historic Preservation study. These are costs associated with that and our recommendation in the end is that the City communicate with Mr. Lane to see if he is willing to bear the cost of any subdivision of that land if it's needed and whether he's willing to bear the costs of the Section 106 review with the federal government.

Alderman Roy asked what is the rough cost or estimate of what Mr. Lane might be looking at?

Mr. Beauchesne replied a subdivision cost if it were necessary would probably run under a couple of thousand dollars we think and that's an estimate sitting here and doing a quick discussion on it. We're just not sure what a Section 106 study costs right now.

Alderman Roy stated this section is outside of the railway and therefore outside of what we need to protect.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes it is.

Alderman Long stated so from what I understand we have to determine whether or not the City has the authority to sell this parcel and if they do they need to go through the Department of Bureau of Environment for that 106 study and also to the DOT.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes. I believe we have the ability to sell the property but there are strings still attached that we would have to get approvals from the state and the federal government.

Alderman Long moved that the City talk with Mr. Lane to see if he'll incur the costs of the studies that need to be done along with the purchase price of the parcel and would bring that to the full Board. Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Forest addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Communication from John O'Connor, PSNH Field Technician, requesting an easement deed for property known as Tax Map 492, Lot 12 in order to allow PSNH to remove an existing line that currently feeds the State of NHDOT shed on Route 101.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to remove item 5 for discussion.

Alderman Roy stated I believe this property is the backside of the softball fields.

Chairman Forest stated the softball fields by Candia Road and Route 101. Anybody know if that's what the area is?

Mr. David Cornell, Chairman Board of Assessors, replied if you have GIS up it's on Groveland Avenue. In the agenda if you flip back onto section 9 there is a map that shows where the parcel is.

Alderman Roy stated I thank you for jumping in to discuss this I know you don't have a team on the field right now when it comes to this discussion but what's bothering me and what I'm kind of looking for is to heard from someone at Parks and Recreation or PSNH or State DOT as to what this project entails, why they need the easements, what's going on without us just blanketing and giving approval to something that may have an impact on a piece of land that could be a future high school or for anything else...open recreational fields now. So I appreciate you being there but there's some frustration of the fact that no one is here to speak to it so out of frustration I'll make the motion to table.

Chairman Forest stated sounds good. I was going to make the recommendation that we table it and get these people here so we know what we're talking about before we approve something.

Alderman Long duly seconded the motion to table. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

TABLED ITEMS

10. Communication from Mayor Guinta requesting staff prepare recommendations relating to placing out to competitive/sealed bid parcels located on Granite Street, Phillippe Cote Way and Seal Tanning parking lot as requested by David Brady of Brady-Sullivan.
(Note: tabled 08/22/2006. Information previously forwarded under separate cover.)

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to remove item 10 from the table for discussion.

Alderman Smith moved to table. I think it's a done deal.

Alderman Roy stated a clarification on the done deal.

Alderman Smith stated no action.

Alderman Roy stated nothing's happened.

Alderman Smith stated nothing's happened from what I understand all parties have been dissolved.

Alderman Roy asked does Mr. MacKenzie concur with that?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I have not had any recent discussion with these people. I know that the Mayor's office and the Economic Development Director have had discussions I just don't know where it stands at this point.

Alderman Roy stated I would like to request a written report from the Mayor's office or Economic Development whoever would like to take the reins on this and let this Committee know what happened to not only the first offer but the second offer and the potential redevelopment of the former Pandora building and I'd like that for our next scheduled meeting. A formal request for a report yes. That was an excellent opportunity for economic growth and development in this City as well as revitalization of an historic building and now to hear that it is a dead project I'd like one of those two department whether it be the Mayor's office that took the reins on this away from the Committee and ran with it or the Economic Development Director that was working to make this happen but I would like a written formal report.

Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion for discussion. I've got literature on this way, way back and if you remember correctly it was almost going to be a done deal with 1848 Associates until the other developer decided he was going to bid on it and then the Mayor came to our meeting in August or September and said that he would work with both parties to come to a final resolution and what I found out is it's a dead deal of all parties involved and now they're looking for probably parking garages or something like that. So, I have to concur with Alderman Roy but to get something from the Mayor and the Economic Development Director and find out if this is dead which I am sure it is.

Alderman Long duly seconded the motion requesting a formal written report. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Deputy Clerk Normand asked do you wish to retable this item?

Alderman Roy replied actually we can receive and file it and the report will come in under new business on our next agenda.

Alderman Smith moved to receive and file. Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

11. Communication from Ms. France Howard requesting to purchase city-owned parcels known as Map 861, Lots 32 & 32A.
Assessors – range of value \$10,400.
Planning – determined surplus to City needs and recommends sale of two parcels to owner of 126 Phillip Street noting a condition to the sale requiring Lots 32 and 32A be merged with Lot 44 to form a single parcel.
Tax Collector – Map 0861/0032 (\$32.30 in back taxes – not including interests and costs) and Map 0861/0032-A (\$6.69 in back taxes – not including interests and costs).
(Tabled 12/05/2006)

This item remained tabled.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Respectfully submitted,

Clerk of Committee